

snapshot illustrations, will be the most interesting chapter in the book. Others may be drawn rather to the South African letters, with their side-lights on the war. But few men who have any sympathy with the athletic side of English life will find the whole book wanting in attraction for them. The profits of its publication are devoted to the Black Watch Widows and Orphans' Fund, so that the purchaser, whilst pleasing himself, is helping a most worthy cause.

H. C. L. STOWELL.

The Month.

THE *Birmingham Gazette* opened the month of April with a rumour that the Bishop of Worcester had resolved to resign. Dr. Perowne has been ordered by his doctor to take some months' rest, and at his age resignation, deeply as many would regret his retirement, would not seem unnatural. Indeed, there are several prelates by whom the stress of diocesan work in these contentious times must be sorely felt. The oldest of the Bishops and Archbishops are :

Prelate.	Born.	Consecrated and translated.
Bishop of Gloucester ...	1819	1863
Archbishop of Canterbury ...	1821	1869, 1885, 1896
Bishop of Llandaff ...	1821	1883
Bishop of Worcester ...	1823	1891
Bishop of Durham ...	1825	1890
Bishop of Oxford ...	1825	1884, 1889
Bishop of Ely ...	1825	1886
Archbishop of York ...	1826	1878, 1891

In point of age, therefore, the Bishop of Worcester ranks fourth of the whole bench, but in date of consecration he is the junior of the older prelates. His activity has been at least equal to that of any in this list, and he would be greatly missed. Few Bishops have had the courage to deal with the extreme Anglican party as quietly and firmly as Dr. Perowne has done.

It can hardly be said that the recent Crown appointments have aroused enthusiasm. The Rev. C. G. Lang is so young—he was born in 1864—that he might very well have waited a little longer before entering on a St. Paul's canonry and a suffragan Bishopric. As to the latter, there is a widely-honoured London incumbent whose name has already been twice submitted as the second of the two sent up to the Crown for a suffragan see in London. To be used thus as a second string and then passed over is the kind of indignity which clergy might well be spared. On the other hand, Canon Lang has done so well at Portsea that he may make both an excellent suffragan and a real power at St. Paul's. Dr. Bigg's appointment as successor to Canon Bright as Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford was rather a relief to those who feared the choice of a young and contentious Anglican. On the whole, Lord Salisbury seems anxious to promote "moderate" men just now.

Eastertide brought new life to the discussion of clerical incomes. The correspondence has overflowed from the columns of ecclesiastical journals into those of the daily press. This is all to the good of the Church, and in some particulars has, no doubt, been to the financial advantage of the incumbents. For the value of Easter offerings, as a means of raising inadequate incomes, and a fit channel by which lay contributions may flow in for the support of the clergy, has been widely insisted on. To the increased publicity given to the method in recent years we may fairly trace the steady growth of the clerical income drawn from this source. In the *Year-Book of the Church* Easter offerings are lumped together with Church collections for the same purpose. It is impossible, therefore, to say just what their advance has been; but the two sources have together produced a total sum which has risen from £120,543 for the year 1895-96 to £141,141 for the year 1899-1900. The total, however, is still a small one—not much more than half of the income from pews-rents, and much less than one-tenth of the income from tithe at its present value. It may always be so, for it is certain that many of the parishes where much aid is most needed and would most willingly be given are those where the people's means are small. At present the largest Easter offerings are in parishes where the incumbent's income is already considerable.

Lord Halifax can hardly have been disappointed by the discussion during the month of April of the message he sent to the E.C.U. meeting on March 12. It will be convenient to recall that message. "Can anyone doubt," Lord Halifax wrote, "that the task laid upon the Church of England at the present time is (1) to insist upon her inherent and indefeasible right to govern herself according to her own principles, free from the interference of those who do not belong to her communion; (2) that it is both the duty and the wisdom of her rulers not to be deterred from exercising this right by the fear of possible legal or Parliamentary difficulties; and (3) that, however extensive and important the rights of the laity may be, the exercise of those rights is strictly dependent upon the fulfilment of the obligations imposed upon the laity as members of the Church?" The discussion of this declaration has very largely resolved itself into a consideration, not of the three duties here defined, but of the general question, Are Churchmen leaning to Disestablishment, even with Disendowment annexed to it? A few years ago such a question would nowhere have been taken seriously; it would have been numbered with the problems characteristic of juvenile debating societies, and dismissed in contempt. Now, however, it is being talked of, apparently in serious tones, by so many groups of Churchmen that the inquiry seems to demand some attention from those who value the link between Church and State. Perhaps they would have taken the question seriously before now but for the once dominant conviction that to discuss English Disestablishment and Disendowment at all was in the nature of a mistake. It may fairly be argued even now that all such discussion helps to familiarize the general public with the idea, and so far to do the work of the Liberation Society. The authorities at Serjeants' Inn could, in the interests of their cause, desire nothing better than that Churchmen should themselves begin to think and talk of Disestablishment as a possible event. Their own attack on the Church has hopelessly failed. Their Society grows year by year less and less of a political power. It has changed its line of argument, and discarded the old virulence of invective; but it cannot compel public notice. In the time of its political insignificance, and in the dark hours of waiting for some vast change in the political feeling of the people, its staff must have an almost pathetic gratitude to the Church-people who will do their work for them. But many who have felt no

inclination to assist in that work are now telling themselves that the question can no longer be set aside. Disestablishment as a policy for the Church is definitely before us. What other conclusion can be drawn from the plan of action sketched by Lord Halifax?

Now, we must all be well aware of the perils that attend the interpreting of any utterance by Lord Halifax. His most fearsome statements have sometimes, it was subsequently found, been meant by him only in a Pickwickian or benevolent sense. But we are compelled to draw a meaning from these three duties recommended to the E.C.U., and we may not be far wrong in interpreting them thus:

1. The Church should insist on the right to govern herself free from Parliamentary control.

2. Her rulers should act in this way, without being influenced by the fear of Disestablishment.

3. They need not trouble themselves about the laity, because only communicants should, in an autonomous Church, hold the franchise.

Lord Halifax's deliverances as to the Church have not—however much they may sound like it—the authority of a Papal utterance, but they do represent a certain fighting element within our Church, and must be considered with respect. If any number of Churchmen act as though they thought Lord Halifax was right, we may sooner or later find the conflict between the Church and State dangerously near us. Given a certain number of people anxious to force the Church into Disestablishment, and that conflict need not be far off. Are such people now, or in the future, likely to be found in sufficient numbers? Let us try to see.

1. No one will dispute the statement that *All Liberationists desire Disestablishment*. But it is worth repeating, because what we have to remember is that the overthrow of the Church does not require the creation of an entirely new body of public opinion, but only such additions to any existing body as will make it operative. This Liberationist party already includes a certain number of clerical and lay Churchmen who are openly in favour of Disestablishment and Disendowment. The existence of such a more or less organized army, biding its time, must never be forgotten.

2. No one can controvert this second statement—*Some High Churchmen desire Disestablishment*. The columns of the *Church Review* seem to supply adequate witness to this. The curious blend of Romanesque pietism and carnal invective which marks that journal often makes it a little difficult to see quite what its writers mean. But, unless they express themselves very badly, some of its contributors and correspondents wish for a Disestablished Church. They appear to be under the impression that Disestablishment and Disendowment would favour the propagation of their own views. Freed from the trammels of the State, they seem to think that the Church would settle down comfortably to a fresh lease of life, in which the politico-religious sentiments of Lord Halifax and the Duke of Newcastle, the Rev. N. Green Armitage and Father Black, would be supreme.

3. Lastly, it can hardly be disputed that *Some Low and many Broad Churchmen desire Disestablishment*. They have arrived at this position slowly and reluctantly, but a variety of considerations seem to have weighed with them. The use of Crown patronage, the ineffectual efforts of the Bishops to cope with clerical disloyalty, and the unsatisfactory position now occupied by the laity, are perhaps amongst the things which weigh most with them.

In the face of these facts, it is the duty of all who value the link between Church and State, and do not wish to see the Church's work thrown back

for a century by the loss of its endowments, to rouse themselves. The danger is all the more real because of the widespread discontent prevalent within the Church. But Disestablishment is a counsel of despair, and if those who to-day are so lightly discussing its possible results would only consider in a little more detail what those results might be, they would hardly lend gratuitous aid to the forces of the Liberation Society.

Reviews.

HOMILETICAL AND DEVOTIONAL LITERATURE.

Unity in Christ and other Sermons. By J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, D.D.
London: Macmillan and Co. Pp. 298.

CANON ARMITAGE ROBINSON'S volume contains twenty sermons, most of which were delivered at Westminster Abbey or at St. Margaret's. They were not written for publication, and they do not form a connected series. One idea, the unity of mankind in Christ, does, however, recur with sufficient frequency to give some coherence to the volume. For this reason there is an advantage in having at the close of the book Canon Armitage Robinson's sermon preached at the consecration of the Bishop of Exeter. For here he speaks of reunion definitely, and in a spirit of hope which, it must be owned, few seem able to reach. It is not clear by what means Canon Armitage Robinson thinks reunion may come, unless the self-government of the Church is to open a way. It is common talk with some Nonconformists that they would join the Church to-morrow if it were free from the State; but it is held with equal strength by others that the severance of the Church from the State would rather strengthen than impair the vigour of the great Nonconformist bodies. They are not, as Canon Armitage Robinson perceives, weaklings struggling for existence, but well-organized agencies, some of which, it is clear, are keeping pace with the population at least as well as the Church is. Are there any signs within them of a tendency to welcome absorption within the English Church? We fear not. But in any case, it is good to have the subject again brought soberly, gravely and charitably before us. These sermons are, we should add, in other ways practical, pointed, and marked by a clear consciousness of present-day needs.

Short Studies in Holiness. By JOHN W. DIGGLE, M.A. London: Hodder and Stoughton. Pp. 214.

Holiness is a subject upon which a good many devout Christian people have gone miserably astray. In revolt from much teaching which seems narrowly to border on a belief in sinless perfection, many persons have avoided the whole subject. It does not follow that they thought holiness the less necessary in the Christian man, but only that they refrained from looking carefully at its character. In the presence of a book like this one from the pen of Archdeacon Diggle, their avoidance of the subject is quite unpardonable. It is not, as he urges in his Introduction, a matter which the devout person can afford to regard with uncertainty or indifference. The Archdeacon's own view of the subject is clear, rational and stimulating. He bids us think of holiness not as the peculiar mark of the ascetic or secluded existence, but as the possible distinction also of the Christian man immersed in business and all the other demands of an active life. His encouragements and warnings